PTO JC22 MAY 31 2005 PAT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re: Application of D. Swistak et al.

Serial No. 10/677,772

Filed: 10/1/03

For: Leaching Chamber with Inward Flaring Sidewall Perforations

Date: May 25, 2005

Examiner: T. Mayo

Art Group: 3671

Atty Docket No. 2313

RESPONSE AND AMENDMENT

To: Commissioner for Patents

Please amend the claims as shown in the attached Status of Claims

REMARKS

This is in response to the office action dated February 25, 2005.

1. In response to the restriction requirement, applicants elect to prosecute Group I (claims 1-7) along with new claims which are in the same Group.

Applicant does not traverse the restriction of Group I vs. the other claims. But applicant does traverse the restriction of the remaining claims into two different groups, namely II and III for the following reasons: The claimed method and mold apparatus are closely tied, and in fact recite similar specific mold parts. The question is whether the mold can be used for carrying out a method different from the claimed method of molding, or vice versa (and not that a chamber might be injection molded using some other mold). Applicant submits that neither is the case. Further that any search for groups II and III will necessarily cover the same ground. Thus, the claims should not be restricted.

2. Applicants have carefully considered whether any change in named inventors is necessary in view of the restriction, and have concluded it is not.